

California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Year 4 Evaluation Report

Lauress L. Wise
Carolyn DeMeyer Harris
Douglas G. Brown
D. E. (Sunny) Becker
Shaobang Sun
Kelly L. Coumbe

Prepared for:

California State Department of Education
Sacramento, CA
Contract Number: 00-07

September 30, 2003

Independent Evaluation of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Year 4 Evaluation Report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

California has just concluded the third year of administering its High School Exit Examination. The requirement that students pass a graduation exam in mathematics and English-language arts (ELA) beginning with the Class of 2004 was established by Senate Bill (SB)-2X passed in 1999 and written into the California Education Code as Chapter 8, Section 60850. This section of the code was further modified through the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 1609 in 2002. The revised legislation that gave the State Board of Education (the Board) authority to postpone the CAHSEE requirement was based in part on a mandated study of the extent to which both test development and standards-based instruction met the criteria for this type of examination. The study report was issued on May 1, 2003 (Wise et al., May 2003). In July of this year, after the completion of the 2002–03 CAHSEE testing, the Board voted to defer the CAHSEE requirement until 2006.

The legislation that authorized the graduation exam also specified an independent evaluation of the CAHSEE. The California Department of Education (CDE) awarded a contract for this evaluation to the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO). HumRRO's efforts focus on analyses of data from tryouts of test questions and from the annual administrations of the CAHSEE, and report on trends in pupil performance and retention, graduation, dropout, and college attendance rates. The legislation also specified that evaluation reporting will include recommendations for improving the quality, fairness, validity, and reliability of the examination. This document meets the contract requirement for a report of activities and findings during the fourth year of the evaluation. Our report examines results beyond those reported in the legislatively mandated January 2002 report covering the 2001 CAHSEE administration (Wise, Sipes, Harris, George, Ford, & Sun, 2002) and in the subsequent report (Wise et al., June 2002).

Test Development, Administration, and Scoring

When the Legislature passed AB 1609 in 2002, it mandated specific changes to the CAHSEE, including a special study of the extent to which the development of the CAHSEE and standards-based instruction met the requirements for a high school graduation test. Evaluation activities were expanded to meet the requirements for this study. A detailed description of the study, along with findings and recommendations, were included in a report to the Board issued May 1 and are not repeated in the present report (Wise et al., May 2003, <http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/cahsee/eval/AB1609/index.html>).

Year 4 evaluation activities summarized in the current report include:

Review of Test Developer Plans and Reports. HumRRO continued to monitor test development activities and reports. These included changes to test administration procedures, equating alternate forms, and changes to reporting procedures.

Analysis of Operational CAHSEE Data. HumRRO analyzed results from the six operational administrations of CAHSEE from July 2002 through May 2003. These included continued administration to 11th graders in the Class of 2004 who had not yet passed one or both parts of the CAHSEE and a census administration to 10th graders in the Class of 2005. Results from the analyses of student test results are described in Chapter 2 of this report. Additional analyses of student responses to survey questions are described in Chapter 3.

Longitudinal Surveys of District and School Sample Personnel. The annual survey of a longitudinal representative sample of 24 districts and approximately 90 of their high schools continued for the fourth consecutive year; one district's refusal required replacement of that district, including three schools. The surveys, which were administered to principals and English-language arts and mathematics teachers, provided a continuing look at schools' perspectives of the impact of the CAHSEE on their programs. In addition, testing coordinators were surveyed for the second year to identify problems with the administration of the CAHSEE. Results from these analyses are described in Chapter 4 of this report.

Findings and Recommendations

The main findings and recommendations stemming from Year 4 evaluation activities are presented in Chapter 5. In brief, the general findings are as follows:

General Finding 1. While precise comparisons are not possible, by the end of 10th grade passing rates for students in the Class of 2005 were slightly lower than passing rates for students in the Class of 2004.

General Finding 2: Available evidence indicates that the CAHSEE has not led to any increase in dropout rates. In fact enrollment declines from 10th to 11th grade for the Class of 2004 were significantly lower than declines for prior high school classes.

General Finding 3: More students in the Class of 2005 believed that the CAHSEE was important to them compared to Class of 2004 students when they were in the 10th grade. Slightly more said they did as well as they could on the exam. Expectations for graduation and post-high school plans were largely unchanged for the Class of 2005 in comparison to the Class of 2004.

General Finding 4: Schools are continuing efforts to ensure that the California academic content standards are covered in instruction and to provide support for students who need additional help in mastering these standards. Many programs that were in the planning stages or only partially implemented a year ago have now been fully implemented.

General Finding 5: Teacher and principal expectations for the impact of CAHSEE on students are largely unchanged from prior years.

General Finding 6: Professional development in the teaching of the content standards has not yet been extensive.

General Finding 7: There were no significant problems with local understanding of test administration procedures, but some issues remain with the provision of student data and the assignment of testing accommodations.

Subsequent to the 2003 administrations, the Board deferred implementation of the CAHSEE requirement to the Class of 2006. Based on information available to date (as summarized in our general findings), we offer four recommendations for future administration of the CAHSEE.

Recommendation 1: Restarting the exam with the Class of 2006 provides some opportunities for improvement; however, careful consideration should be given to any changes that are implemented.

The AB 1609 study report (Wise et al., May 2003) included several recommendations for changes that could ensure better alignment of what is tested with what is taught, making it easier for all students to demonstrate adequate mastery of the intended content. At its July 2003 meeting, the Board approved plans to shorten the ELA testing to a single day and to reduce cognitive demands for mathematics questions while still assessing the same standards. Changes to the score scale and possibly even the reexamination of test content specifications are also being considered.

Given the opportunity to restart the CAHSEE for the Class of 2006 next year, consideration of such changes is entirely appropriate. An exact equating of scores from new administrations to scores from prior administrations is not necessary, since the prior administrations no longer “count.” (All students tested to date are no longer required to pass the CAHSEE.) Nonetheless, the time to implement changes is very short. Forms for the 2004 administrations must be printed by about December of this year, so there is no time to develop and field test new questions. In addition, current procedures have worked very well. A careful review will be needed to ensure that proposed alternatives will work equally well.

We are particularly concerned that there be adequate technical review of plans to reduce the testing time for ELA to a single day. Members of the original HSEE Standards Panel that recommended the content to be covered by the test felt strongly about the need for students to demonstrate their ability to write coherently. To what extent will eliminating one of the two essay questions increase errors in classifying students as passing or not passing? Will the relative weight assigned to writing versus reading and to the writing standards covered by the essays in particular be changed? There is, unfortunately, not time for the Board to seek the advice of another panel of content experts on these matters, but a careful technical review is both feasible and important.

Recommendation 2: The California Department of Education and the State Board of Education should continue to monitor and encourage efforts by districts and schools to implement effective standards-based instruction.

Results from the AB 1609 study (Wise et al., May 2003) indicated that standards-based instruction was widely available in both middle and high schools. High school instruction includes significant new efforts to provide second-chance opportunities for students who did

not fully master required skills during initial instruction. The study also found, however, that current instruction was not effective in that many students taking the standards-based courses offered still could not pass the CAHSEE. There were indications that instruction was likely to improve for students in high school classes beyond 2004 and 2005. Ensuring that effective instruction is available to all students remains critical to the successful implementation of the CAHSEE requirements. CDE must monitor further improvements to standards-based instruction and both CDE and the Board should encourage further efforts in this regard. Providing information on exemplary programs to other districts is one example of how such efforts might be encouraged.

Recommendation 3: Professional development for teachers is a significant opportunity for improvement.

Results from the AB 1609 study indicated that many students were taking initial and remedial courses covering the California academic content standards included on the CAHSEE, but were not benefiting fully from these courses. One reason was that the students did not have important prerequisite knowledge or skills. Additional professional development for teachers could help them be more effective in the courses they are already teaching and also could help them identify students needing additional help with prerequisite skills. One particular target of opportunity identified in the AB 1609 study was that a significant number of teachers involved in remedial mathematics had considerable experience with special education students, but less training in mathematics itself.

Recommendation 4: Further consideration of the CAHSEE requirements for special education students is needed, in light of the low passing rates for this group. Apparent disparities between racial and ethnic groups within the special education population require further investigation.

In our evaluation activities, we have introduced separate consideration of special education students who are able to participate in regular classes and those who cannot. Treating all special education students as a single group may mask solutions that could help those able to master critical content standards, while setting more realistic expectations for students who cannot reasonably be expected to master these standards.

The very low passing rate, particularly in mathematics, for special education students who are African American or Hispanic deserves further investigation. Are these students somehow more severely handicapped? Are they concentrated in less effective schools? How can we best understand and remediate these discrepancies?

Overall, the CAHSEE requirement continues to have a significant impact on instruction and student achievement. Much work remains to be done in helping all students meet the standards for high school graduation that have been established. CDE and the Board face continuing challenges in implementing the CAHSEE requirement.

Independent Evaluation of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Year 4 Evaluation Report Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	ix
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
THE CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMINATION	1
PRIOR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOMES	1
<i>Summary of Year 1 Activities (June 2000)</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>District Baseline Survey Resulting from Year 1 Activities (December 2000)</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Summary of Year 2 Activities (June 2001)</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Summary of Year 3 Activities (June 2002)</i>	<i>5</i>
SUMMARY OF YEAR 4 EVALUATION ACTIVITIES	7
<i>Special Study of Standards-Based Instruction (May 2003).....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Other Year 4 Activities.....</i>	<i>8</i>
ORGANIZATION AND CONTENTS OF YEAR 4 EVALUATION REPORT	8
CHAPTER 2: RESULTS FROM THE 2002–03 ADMINISTRATIONS.....	11
INTRODUCTION	11
WHO TESTED?	11
SCORING CONSISTENCY.....	13
WHO PASSED?	15
TESTING ACCOMMODATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS.....	20
RELATIONSHIP OF CAHSEE RESULTS TO OTHER TEST RESULTS.....	23
PERFORMANCE OF REPEAT TEST TAKERS	25
SUMMARY	26
CHAPTER 3: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE	29
INTRODUCTION	29
SURVEY ITEMS	30
FINDINGS	31
<i>Number of Respondents.....</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Test Preparation.....</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Importance of the Test.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Plans for High School and Beyond.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Perceived Test Performance and Influencing Factors</i>	<i>41</i>
SUMMARY	44
CHAPTER 4: PRINCIPAL, TEACHER, AND SITE TESTING COORDINATOR REACTIONS.....	45
INTRODUCTION	45
SURVEY DEVELOPMENT	45
SAMPLING AND ADMINISTRATION.....	46

PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER FINDINGS	47
<i>Background</i>	48
<i>Awareness</i>	50
<i>Preparation Thus Far</i>	51
<i>Use of Results</i>	57
<i>Expectations</i>	61
<i>Other</i>	75
<i>Summary</i>	78
SITE TESTING COORDINATOR FINDINGS	80
<i>Preparation</i>	80
<i>Logistics</i>	81
<i>Accommodations and Modifications</i>	83
<i>Summary</i>	84
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	87
GENERAL FINDINGS	87
RECOMMENDATIONS	89
REFERENCES.....	93
APPENDIX A CAHSEE PRINCIPAL SURVEY—SPRING 2003	A-1
APPENDIX B CAHSEE TEACHER SURVEY—SPRING 2003.....	B-1
APPENDIX C CAHSEE SCHOOL SITE TESTING COORDINATOR SURVEY— SPRING 2003	C-1

List of Tables

TABLE 2.1 Number of Students Taking the CAHSEE ELA Exam in 2002–03 by Grade and Administration.....	12
TABLE 2.2 Number of Students Taking the CAHSEE Mathematics Exam in 2002–03 by Grade and Administration.....	13
TABLE 2.3 Scoring Consistency for Student Essays.....	14
TABLE 2.4 Percent of Essays Assigned Each Score Level by Each Scorer—First Essay.....	15
TABLE 2.5 Percent of Essays Assigned Each Score Level by Each Scorer—Second Essay.....	15
TABLE 2.6 Passing Rates by Demographic Group—English-Language Arts.....	16
TABLE 2.7 Passing Rates by Demographic Group—Mathematics.....	17
TABLE 2.8 Passing Rates for Class of 2005 Students by Student Category and Race.....	18
TABLE 2.9 2002–03 ELA Passing Rates by English Language Fluency.....	19
TABLE 2.10 2002–03 Mathematics Passing Rates by Highest Math Course Taken.....	20
TABLE 2.11 Frequency and Passing Rates for Test Accommodations and Modifications—Class of 200421	
TABLE 2.12 Frequency and Passing Rates for Test Accommodations and Modifications—Class of 200522	
TABLE 2.13 Enrollment Declines from 9th Grade to 10th Grade.....	23
TABLE 2.14 Enrollment Declines from 10th Grade to 11th Grade.....	23
TABLE 2.15 Results from the STAR 2003 and 2002 9 th and 10 th Grade ELA Assessments.....	24
TABLE 2.16 Results from the STAR 2003 and 2002 9 th and 10 th Grade Algebra I Assessments.....	25
TABLE 2.17 Mean and Standard Deviation of Score Gains for Repeat Test-Takers in Class of 2004.....	26
 TABLE 3.1 Number of Respondents to the Student Questionnaire After Taking Test in Different Cohorts31	
 TABLE 4.1 Teacher-Reported Percentages of Highest Level of Education.....	48
TABLE 4.2 Principal-Reported Percentages of Grades Taught at School.....	48
TABLE 4.3 Principal-Reported Percentages of Schools’ Student-Counselor Ratio.....	48
TABLE 4.4 Teacher-Reported Percentages of Student English Fluency.....	49
TABLE 4.5 Teachers-Reported Percentages of Student Preparation for Proficiency on the CAHSEE....	49
TABLE 4.6 Teacher-Reported Percentages of Student Time Spent of ELA or Mathematics Assignments	49
TABLE 4.7 Principal-Estimated Percentage of Students and Parents Familiar with CAHSEE.....	51
TABLE 4.8 Principal-Reported Percentages of Preparations for Alignment with California Academic Content Standards.....	52
TABLE 4.9 Percentage of Principals Reporting Similarity between District and State Standards.....	52
TABLE 4.10a Percentage of Teachers Indicating Coverage of ELA Standards by Curriculum.....	53
TABLE 4.10b Percentage of Teachers Indicating Coverage of Mathematics Standards by Curriculum..	53
TABLE 4.11 Percentage of Teachers Estimating Various Amounts of Time on CAHSEE Activities.....	54
TABLE 4.12 Percentage of Teachers Rating Quality of Professional Development Experiences.....	54
TABLE 4.13 Percentage of Principals Undertaking Activities to Prepare Faculty/Staff for CAHSEE Administration.....	57
TABLE 4.14 Percentage of Principals Indicating Plans for Activities to Assist High School Students Who Do Not Pass the Exit Exam Or Who Do Not Seem Prepared to Take It.....	58
TABLE 4.15 Principals’ Estimates of Percentages of 10 th grade Students Meeting ELA and Mathematics CAHSEE Standards.....	62
Percent Expected to Meet Standard.....	62
TABLE 4.16 Teachers’ Ratings of Preparedness of Students in the 10 th Grade (in percentages).....	63
TABLE 4.17 Principals’ Predicted Impact of CAHSEE on Student Motivation and Parental Involvement (in percentages).....	64
TABLE 4.18 Teachers’ Predicted Impact of CAHSEE on Student Motivation and Parental Involvement (in percentages).....	66

<i>TABLE 4.19 Principals' and Teachers' Predicted Impact of CAHSEE on Student Retention and Dropout Rates (in percentages).....</i>	<i>68</i>
<i>TABLE 4.20 Teachers' Predictions of Influence of CAHSEE on Instructional Practices Over Time (in percentages).....</i>	<i>71</i>
<i>TABLE 4.21 Principals' 2001 and 2002 Estimates of the Percentage of Students with Instruction in Content Standards (in percentages)</i>	<i>74</i>
<i>TABLE 4.22 Percentage of Principals Indicating Factors Affecting Student Success on CAHSEE</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>TABLE 4.23 Percentage of Principals Indicating Actions to Promote Student Learning</i>	<i>76</i>
<i>TABLE 4.24 Responsibility Felt by Teachers Other Than ELA and Mathematics (percentages as perceived by principals, ELA, and math teachers).....</i>	<i>78</i>
<i>TABLE 4.25 Surveyed Teachers' Own and Others' Opinions of the CAHSEE (in percentages).....</i>	<i>78</i>
<i>TABLE 4.26 Site Coordinator Responses and Positions.....</i>	<i>80</i>
<i>TABLE 4.27 Site Coordinator Sources of Information on Administering CAHSEE (in percentages)</i>	<i>80</i>
<i>TABLE 4.28 How Schools Handled Students Who Finished First Section Early (in percentages)</i>	<i>82</i>
<i>TABLE 4.29 How Schools Handled Students Who Had Not Finished by Time of Break Between Sessions (in percentages).....</i>	<i>82</i>
<i>TABLE 4.30 How Schools Handled Students Who Had Not Finished by Lunchtime (in percentages).....</i>	<i>82</i>
<i>TABLE 4.31 How Schools Scheduled Students in Other Grades During CAHSEE Administration (in percentages).....</i>	<i>83</i>
<i>TABLE 4.32 Impact of CAHSEE Administration on Attendance in Other Grades (in percentages)</i>	<i>83</i>
<i>TABLE 4.33 Proportion of Eligible EL and SD Students Tested (in percentages).....</i>	<i>83</i>
<i>TABLE 4.34 Accommodations Provided (in percentages).....</i>	<i>84</i>
<i>TABLE 4.35 Modifications Provided (in percentages).....</i>	<i>84</i>

List of Figures

Figure 3.1 Different cohorts' responses to Question 1—How did you prepare for this test?—after taking the ELA test.	32
Figure 3.2 Different cohorts' responses to Question 1—How did you prepare for this test?—after taking the math test.....	33
Figure 3.3 Different cohorts' responses to Question 2—How important is this test to you?—after taking the ELA test.	33
Figure 3.4 Different cohorts' responses to Question 2—How important is this test to you?—after taking the math test.....	34
Figure 3.5 Different cohorts' responses to Question 3—Do you think you will graduate from high school?—after taking the ELA test.....	35
Figure 3.6 Different cohorts' responses to Question 3—Do you think you will graduate from high school?—after taking the math test.	36
Figure 3.7 Different cohorts' responses to Question 4—Will it be harder to graduate if you have to pass a test like this?—after taking the ELA test.	37
Figure 3.8 Different cohorts' responses to Question 4—Will it be harder to graduate if you have to pass a test like this?—after taking the math test.....	37
Figure 3.9 Different cohorts' responses to Question 5—What do you think you will do after high school?—after taking the ELA test.....	38
Figure 3.10 Different cohorts' responses to Question 5—What do you think you will do after high school?—after taking the math test.	39
Figure 3.11 Different cohorts' responses to Question 6—How sure are you about what you will do after high school?—after taking the ELA test.....	40
Figure 3.12 Different cohorts' responses to Question 6—How sure are you about what you will do after high school?—after taking the math test.....	40
Figure 3.13 Different cohorts' responses to Question 7—How well did you do on this test?—after taking the ELA test.	41
Figure 3.14 Different cohorts' responses to Question 7—How well did you do on this test?—after taking the math test.....	42
Figure 3.15 Different cohorts' responses to Question 8—The main reasons I did not do as well on this test as I could have are...—after taking the ELA test.....	43
Figure 3.16 Different cohorts' responses to Question 8—The main reasons I did not do as well on this test as I could have are...—after taking the math test.....	43
 Figure 4.1a Percentage of principals reporting activities undertaken in preparation for the Spring 2001, 2002, and 2003 administrations of the CAHSEE.....	 55
Figure 4.1b. Percentage of teachers reporting activities undertaken in preparation for the Spring 2001, 2002, and 2003 administrations of the CAHSEE.....	56
Figure 4.2 Percentage of principals in 2003 reporting plans for remediation of students who do not pass the CAHSEE.....	60
Figure 4.3a Percentage of principals predicting increased or strongly increased student motivation and parental involvement in 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.	65
Figure 4.3b Percentage of teachers predicting increased or strongly increased student motivation and parental involvement in 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.....	67
Figure 4.4a Percentage of principals predicting increased or strongly increased student retention and dropout rates in 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.	69
Figure 4.4b Percentage of teachers predicting increased or strongly increased student retention and dropout rates in 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.....	69

Figure 4.5a. Principals' predictions of influence of the CAHSEE on instructional practices over time.	70
Figure 4.5b. Teachers' predictions of influence of the CAHSEE on instructional practices over time.	70
Figure 4.6a. Principals' estimates of the percentage of students who have had instruction in ELA content standards (ordered by least instruction).	73
Figure 4.6b. Principals' estimates of the percentage of students who have had instruction in mathematics content standards (ordered by least instruction).	73
Figure 4.7. Percentage of principals indicating the percentage of teachers who understand the difference between "teaching to the test" and "aligning the curriculum and instruction to the standards" in 2001, 2002, and 2003.	77